

FY2017 WYOMING 319 EVALUATION AND SCORING SHEET

Section I. Project Information and Requirements—to be completed by WDEQ		
Project Name:	Project Sponsor:	
Project Type:	RFP Priority Rating: ___High (10 pts) ___Medium (5 pts) ___Low (0 pts)	
Amount Funding Requested: \$	Amount Non-Federal Match: \$	% Match:
Eligible Funding Sources: ___319 Program ___319 Project ___205(j) ___SEP	Sponsor submitted draft proposal for optional pre-review: ___YES ___NO	
WDEQ Comments	Y/N	Comments
The project addresses nonpoint source (NPS) pollution and is eligible for Section 319 funding.		
The project addresses water quality objectives identified in the Wyoming NPS Management Plan.		
Project addresses an impaired waterbody or protects a high quality waterbody.		
Project addresses a significant source of NPS pollution in the watershed.		
The project met all administrative requirements outlined in the Request For Proposals.		
If applicable, planning requirements have been met and project implements the plan.		
If applicable, WGFD consistency letter obtained for Sage Grouse Core Area Protection.		
If applicable, past performance of project sponsor has been satisfactory.		
Other general comments:		
Additional information requested from sponsor:		

Section II. Scoring Matrix—to be completed by NPS Task Force		Proposal Location	Score* (0, 1, 2, 3)	Weight	Points Awarded**
1	The project addresses an important water quality need for the State of Wyoming and the project is designed to effectively address that need.	Section II.A and III		10	
2	The project involves appropriate partners and has significant stakeholder support. Adequate non-federal match has been secured for the project and match sources are appropriate for the project.	Section IV		7	
3	Pre-project planning has taken place to help ensure the timely and successful completion of the project. Any preliminary research, planning or other activities needed to fully develop the project scope have been completed.	Section II.B		5	
4	Goals and products are clearly defined/attainable; project is focused on measurable outcomes.	Section III		5	
5	Project costs are reasonable as compared to anticipated results.	Budget		5	
6	The project includes methods to evaluate project effectiveness or justification as to why such methods (e.g., water quality monitoring) are not the best use of resources or should be postponed to a later time.	Section V		5	
7	The project has clearly identified tasks that include adequate information to describe work to be accomplished.	Section III.B		3	
8	The project will provide outreach and education using effective and targeted methods, or an explanation of why outreach/education is not the best use of funds has been provided.	Section V.I.F		3	
9	Sufficient technical and managerial resources are available to facilitate successful completion of the project.	Section VI.A, B		3	
10	The project will promote long-term and self-maintaining natural, ecological and social processes that will protect water quality.	Section VI.C		3	
11	Project will be implemented in a timely and efficient manner, according to a reasonable schedule.	Section VI.I		3	
12	To the extent possible, sponsor has made efforts to design the project in such a manner to benefit other resources (e.g., wildlife, fisheries, soil health, water conservation) in addition to water quality.	Section V.I.G		3	
Task Force Score					
RFP Priority Points (from Section I)					
Bonus Points: Award 10 points to project sponsors that have committed to conducting BMP follow-up monitoring per WDEQ guidance as part of their proposed project.					
Total Score					
Preliminary Funding Recommendation (FF = Fully Fund, PF+ = Partial Fund >50%, PF- = Partial fund <50%, NF = Not fund)					

*1, 2 and 3 correspond to Low, Medium and High, respectively (i.e. 3 = High). 0 indicates the application does not address the question.

**To calculate Points Awarded, multiply the Score by the Weight Factor (i.e. 3 x 2= 6 Points Awarded)